DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 971 RC 012 268

AUTHOR Gutierrez, Veronica
TITLE Language Attitudes of and Toward Spanish/English Bilinguals.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anglo Americans; *Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Students; English; Ethnicity; Immigrants; *Language Attitudes; *Mexican Americans; Social Attitudes; Sociolinguistics; Spanish; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Chicano Movement; *United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

The causes and effects of resistance to the acknowledgement and appreciation of the language skills and characteristics of United States Southwest bilinguals can be seen in both the Hispanic and Anglo communities. The cultural inferiority ideology of Americans to Mexicans is a historical cause of this resistance, and it is reflected in the bilingual's attitude towards his own speech. Many studies have indicated an inverse relationship between the bilingual's use of the ethnic language and his attitude towards it. The Chicano movement has deepened the anti-Spanish-language attitude observed especially within the less assimilated portion of the bilingual community. The attitudes of public school teachers also play an important role in students' acceptance or rejection of their mother tongue and heritage. Teacher attitudes, often less than objective, can result in low academic achievement for bilingual students. Teacher attitudes are but a small part of the greater Anglo ethnocentrism which has characterized United States opinion, policy, and practice. Bilingual education, in the sense of bilingual maintenance programs, is seen by many as a solution to the problem of accepting linguistic diversity. Another is recognition by both Anglo and bilingual communities of the value of linguistic diversity. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192971

LANGUAGE ATTITUDES OF AND TOWARD SPANISH/ENGLISH BILINGUALS

by
Verónica Gutiérrez
Princeton University '83
Princeton, NJ 08544

1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Veronica Gutierrez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC 012268

With the rise in the Mexican American population of the Southwest, it has become increasingly difficult to satisfy the linguistic needs of the bilingual community. As a result, attempts have been made to modify the stringent Anglo ethnocentric attitudes of the dominant group in order to make a dent in this country's language policy. However, these slight changes leave much to be desired, and the Mexican American battle for the recognition of the positive aspects of bilingualism continues.

Concrete results toward this end can be made possible only after some of the more abstract aspects of bilingualism are less feared and more appreciated. Thus, it follows that an attitudinal effort should be made to understand and accept at least some generalities of bilingualism. Such an effort would form the basis of any successful attempt for the advancement of the bilingual community. However, many studies have encountered a resistance to the acknowledgment and appreciation of its language skills and characteristics. In this largely interpretative paper (and I would like to emphasize interpretative), I will discuss some of the causes and effects of this resistance.

One of the most influential factors in the formation of language attitudes in the U.S. has been the cultural inferiority ideology of Americans towards Mexicans, which can be historically traced to the Mexican-American War. Since then, "Chicano-Anglo relations have been characterized by a great deal of conflict."[1] The extinction of this conflict has not been aided by the early American sociologists, whose misconception of, and negative attitude toward, minorities is explained in Manuel Ramírez' words[2]:

> American social scientists have abstracted a mythical "superculture" from the behaviors and psycho-dynamics of an American "majority." In comparison with this superculture, all other sociocultural systems have been judged to have less value and status. Within the assimilationist context that this has fostered, members of minority groups have been expected to abandon identification with their native cultures and to strive for identification with the superculture fabrication of the social scientists. Membership in a minority group has been regarded not as a potential source of multicultural functioning but as a developmental disadvantage. In American society, the minority group member has been expected to "overcome" the "obstacles" of this "disadvantage" and to learn to function "appropriately."

This assimilationist attitude has been embraced by American society and has far-reaching implications bilinguals themselves, and the educational environment and language policy in this country.

Before delving further into a discussion of language attitudes it may be necessary to define the term itself. According to Arnulfo Ramírez, language attitudes are "evaluative reactions or feelings toward language use." These feelings may involve a general feeling toward the language (French sounds nice), an an attitude toward the language as being identified with a certain group (communists speak Russian), and a reaction toward the use of specific variety of a language under certain circumstances.[3] The latter seems to be the most important in considering the situation of the bilingual.

The match guise test has been proven to be the most popular method for measuring language attitudes. A general explanation of this paradigm will suffice for the purpose of the discussion

to follow. Essentially, it involves the use of video and audio tapes which are individually controlled and whose pairings may be manipulated by the researcher. After being exposed to various combinations of these tapes and speech forms, the subject is asked to rate the people he has just seen and heard on several basis (correctness of speech, appropriateness for school, likelihood of achievement, etc.).[4a] Some modified versions of this model may ask the subject to react to the guises in terms of social and/or economic status and the likelihood of advancement in these areas.

Language Attitudes of Bilinguals

The importance of the bilingual's attitude toward his own speech cannot be overemphasized. "Since," according to Ryan and Carranza, "a group's own attitudes of pride or inferiority can affect how its members are viewed by others, appreciation by society in general of Mexican American ways of speaking and of behaving would be enhanced" if Mexican Americans viewed their own speech variations positively.[4b]

Studies of these attitudes have attempted to place the bilingual's attitude toward his own language. Flores and Hooper (1975), for example, made the following observations among 47 Mexican Americans ranging from 16 to 74 years of age and 15 college students[5]:

> Those with "Chicano" as prefered self-referent rated Tex-Mex Spanish significantly higher than standard English; and individuals with low use of Spanish and those with at least some college education preferred standard Spanish to standard English. This surprising inverse relationship between use of the ethnic language and attitude

towards it has been found in several other studies. (cf. Fishman, 1966)."

Politzer and Ryan, in their match guise experiments, found that Spanish was rated more highly by some subgroups such as Mexican Americans, females, and older students.[6] Meanwhile, third and sixth grade Anglo children rated English higher than Spanish. The difference in language attitudes between younger and older students has little to do with age. Instead, it is the difference in friends and an appreciation for their language which may account for the different ratings. Ryan and Carranza also observed that "Mexican Americans, especially the younger generation, appreciate their own American varieties at least for some purpose."[7]

However, even bilinguals seemed to castigate a subgroup within their community. Arnulfo Ramírez found that accented English was rated just as poorly by bilinguals as it was by Anglo monolinguals.[8] In fact, accented English received an even lower rating than code switching. All of this may also be due to an absorption of the Anglo attitudes toward non-English varieties of language. The human tendency to reject that which is different and deviating from the familiar, may also be a cause for the overall rejection of accented English.

It is interesting to note that, in another study, Dworkin (1965, 1971) found a possible condition for Mexican Americans' rejection of their own mother tongue. He found that "Mexican American adults who were born in Mexico and had lived in the United States for a shorter period of time were less negative

toward their Mexican background than were Mexican Americans born in the United States or who were born in Mexico but had lived in the United States for a longer period of time."[9] The degree to which this negative attitude was due to an incorporation of American values in the assimilation process is not known. However, it seems that it was highly influenced by a new, Mexican perception of the English language and the weight it carries in this new culture.

Ryan and Carranza found that parents usually rated English higher for practical reasons and Spanish was highly rated for idealistic and personal reasons.[10] It seems logical that struggling immigrants would rate English greater than Spanish in status and solidarity scales when they view it as a tool for social and economic success in an American society. Andrew Cohen also found the same trend in his studies[11],

> Bilingual parents...saw English both as a means of making friends and as a means for becoming better educated and for getting a job.

Many parents, especially those out of reach of any kind of bilingual education programs would not see Spanish in the same favorable light as would parents participating in such programs, especially in reference to educational attainment.

Flores and Hopper's (1973) findings, that "the groups with the highest regard for Standard English were the ones with the least access to it"[12] also support the idea of a survival tactic used by immigrants. However, at a later stage in the community's bilingual proficiency[13] there seems to be a trend to identify oneself as Mexican. Derbyshire's 1969 study of attitudes in

East Los Angles found that "immigrant teenagers highly identified themselves as 'Mexican.'"[14] The strategy of more assimilated bilinguals is to revolt against the pressures to learn English and the assimilation process itself.

At this point many Mexican Americans begin to resent what seems to be a heritage denial by their more assimilated counterparts. This is evidenced in George Sánchez' very familiar exclamation, "I know my friends in New Mexico like to call themselves 'Spanish-American'; they are very proud of being Spanish. Well, I say a Spanish-American is a Mexican who has learned how to speak English!"[15] Attitudes such as these are largely responsible for, or a part of the emergence of the Chicano movement.

The Chicano movement itself, however, has also had negative attitudinal affects on bilinguals. In Cohen's questionnaire asking for a ranking of the two best and one worst reasons for learning Spanish, the statement "thinking and acting as a Mexican American"[16] received opposite ratings from parents involved in the bilingual program and parents of the comparison group. The latter group saw it as one of the two best reasons and the former considered it the worst. The only possible reason for this, as seen by Cohen, was the fact that bilingual parents, due to their language dominance, answered the Spanish version of the questionnaire in which Mexican American was translated as "Chicano."[17]

Thus, the changing self-perception of our bilingual communities must be unified, if in nothing else, in a positive feeling towards ourselves and those things associated with who we are. In this way, the dominant group may begin to accept,

acknowledge, and appreciate our language skills and characteristics.

Teachers' Attitudes Toward Bilinguals

The obstacles placed before this unity are largely due to the already effective influence of the dominant group. The classroom, being one of its instruments, transmits a large portion of this society's language attitudes on to bilinguals. Barnes (1973) defines the role of language in the classroom as being for "infromation, and maintenance and confirmation of social identity, and the relationship of the participants."[18] However, the kind social identity here is questionable. In a limited sense, identifying with the dominant language group may lead to a loss of identification with elements associated with the mother tongue. Lily Wong Fillmore's favorable acclaim of Nora's attitude and technique to learn English is but one example of the pressure toward conformity and uniformity in American society. Nora, says Fillmore, "not only wanted to be around English speakers, she wanted to be like them, and, therefore, she adopted their way of talking."[19] However, it also happened that Nora rejected her Mexican friends at school and her mother tongue at home. The desire to learn a new language which might help one succeed socially and economically in the long run, is very favorable and should be encouraged. But, in my view, not at the expense of the pride in, and knowledge of one's first language and heritage.

As it is the teacher who may convey and project the attitudes toward bilingualism onto the children, it is important to

note some of these attitudes. Ramírez hypothesized that "pupils' grades and actual reading achievement may have some relation to the congruence of pupil's attitudes with teachers' attitudes."[20] This is important to note when considering Seligman et al.'s (1972) finding that "teacher's judgememts about students' academic abilities were made on the basis of speech and physical appearance instead of relying on objective, pertinent information."[21]

If such judgements hold, then surely it would be expected that the children involved would be subject to differential treatment. Misconceptions due to adittudinal reactions toward speech may illicit low expectations among teachers, which would be very harmful to the students if such attitudes were incorporated in the Hawthorne effect.

Williams classified teachers' attitudes toward speech patterns in the following two clusters[22]:

1. Ethnicity and Nonstandardness
   - Standard American/Ethnic Style
   - White-like/Nonwhite-like
   - High Social Status/Low Social Status
   - Advantaged/Disadvantaged
2. Overall Evaluation of a Child's Confidence-Eagerness
   - Confident/Unsure
   - Active/Passive
   - Eager/Reticent
   - Enthusiastic/Hesitant
   - Talk/Doesn't Talk

By behaving in a manner which corresponds to their attitudes, teachers reflect their attitudes on the students. As Ramírez found in 1978[23]:

> Teachers' negative attitudes toward code-switching (and correspondingly strong positive attitudes toward standard English) generate low assessments of their pupil's language abilities and performance and lead to low grades in English.

Language Attitudes, Policy, and Anglo Ethnocentrism

Be they as well meaning as they wish, teachers may often do more harm than good through their rejection of language variations. However, their attitudes are merely one aspect of the greater Anglo ethnocentric approach to dealing with bilinguals, especially in education.

The main reason for the inferior conception of Spanish in the Southwest is a historical one. Since it is the language of a minority group, it tends to carry with it the lower status of that group. As a result it would take "some major change for social attitudes toward it to change."[24] In fact, as Spolsky says, "the very arguments presented for the minority language, (that it is related to folk culture, that it reflects the warmth of the home, etc.), are ones that prepare it for a second class status in an institution like school where the formal values, (written literature, the modern technological world, etc.), have first place."[25] This attitude toward Spanish is supported in Arthur et al.'s 1974 match guise test for Anglo college students. The results showed that negative reaction "was not towards Mexican Americans, but towards Mexican Americans who speak a dialect heavily laden with non-standard phonetic features."[26]

The inclination to "correct" such deviations from the standard language of the dominant group has historically characterized language policy in the United States. It is evidenced in the transitional, as opposed to maintenance goals and policies of bilingual education programs. Transitional programs employ a gradual shift toward the total use of English, which may often

make them nothing more than remedial English programs. The maintenance model, on the other hand, continues tc partially use the mother tongue as one median of instruction, even after English language proficiency has been achieved. It is unfortunate, however, that the benefits of this latter model have yet to be recognized and acknowledged by most Americans. The strong ethnocentric inclinations in this country have instilled very negative attitudes toward such a venture into bilingual education. Despite some reforms, this view has continued to prevail. It is most markedly exemplified in the very recent set of proposed regulations published by the Department of Education (Federal Register, Aug. 5, 1980). For example, these proposed regulations are geared to terminate comprehensive bilingual programs as soon as possible. The criteria set for specifying when a student is no longer required to receive bilingual instruction are the following[27]:

1) a determination that the student is no longer limited English proficient
2) the student has been in a bilingual instruction program for two years and either is comparably proficient in English and his or her language, or scores at or above the 30th percentile using an assessment procedure to determine limited English proficiency; or
3) The student has been in a bilingual program for five years. Also, a parent may ask to have his or her child removed from a bilingual program at any time.

These criteria most obviously dismiss the possibility that there is any benefit to bilingual education or that someone may even "want" their child to be enrolled is a bilingual program. The proposed regulations almost admit that they are for remedial English programs by allowing for their termination after two years and by setting a minimum score at the 30th percentile on

a reading achievement. If such a low mark is set for English proficiency, to what greater degree must Spanish be neglected?

Fears and uncertainties about introducing other languages and cultures into young classrooms have repeatedly characterized the stereotypic restraints put on minority language use and culture in school. In an attempt to justify these fears, or better yet, to displace the reasons for the resulting attitudes, the government attempted to justify non-English language prohibition policies with the following list of reasons[28]:

1. English is the standard language in the U. S. for all citizens to speak.
2. The pupil's best interests served if he speaks English well. English enhances the opportunity for education and employment. Spanish is a handicap.
3. Proper English enables Mexican Americans to compete with Anglos.
4. Teachers and pupils do not speak Spanish. It is impolite to speak a language not understood by all.

This last reason would be somewhat ironic in a classroom where half the students (or more) speak no English! Currently the government would most likely not make such claims openly, but even with the pressure for change from minority groups, these hardly justifiable justifications continue to underlie the formation of language attitudes of the dominant society.

The English-only policies resulting from these attitudes may also be psychologically harmful to the bilingual, as Ryan and Carranza explain[29]:

> This pressure (to speak English) is based on the implicit assumption that English is superior and all other varieties inferior. The Mexican American becomes involved in the dilemma of giving up his language (an integral part of his personality and identity) and becoming assimilated into the

> majority society or else retaining it and dealing with the consequences of resisting assimilation.

Furthermore, as adolescents suffer a bit in adjusting to the "adult world," the magnitude of the bilingual's identity crises is further aggravated by his dilemma of language and assimilation. Due to the dominant culture's rejection of many aspects of cultural diversity,[30] this dilemma cannot be solved until the barriers of that rejection are elliminated.

One way of doing this is through bilingual education. This solution is explained by Spolsky when he says[31],

> The major attitudinal claim put forward for bilingual education is that it encourages the pupils' self-respect to discover that their home language, in which they have such warm associations is respected or at least not maligned by the school system.

Such improved attitudinal change would be benefical for society as a whole, but would be especially healthy for bilingual students whose new attitudes would be instrumental in enhanceing their educational achievement. English monolingual children would also stand to benefit greatly from such a program which would in turn be a great benefit for the country itself. As Sánchez so explicitly stated[32],

> The fact that a child speaks a foreign language when he comes to school, in this case Spanish, is no handicap; it is an asset, and the sooner that we in public education recognize that, the sooner we will get along farther in our international relations.

Yet, bilingual education programs are far from being widely accepted by American educational systems. Most are still frowned upon by the dominant society which believes that bicultural experiences are negative. This is, however, a great misconception

as Ramírez explains[33]:

> Recent research, some of it conducted by Chicano investigators, has indicated that the bicultural experiences of Chicanos may in fact provide the basis for more flexible and sophisticated psychological adjustment. For example, Long and Padilla surveyed successful (Ph.D. recipients) and unsuccessful (dropouts) Chicano graduate students at the University of New Mexico. They found that 94% of the successful students but only 7 to 8% of the unsuccessful students reported being reared in bilingual homes.

Ramírez and Castañeda (1974) also found that[34]:

> bicultural elementary school children in Southern California demonstrated greater flexibility in their behavior than "monocultural" children. The bicultural children exhibited greater ability to shift learning and social behaviors according to the demands of a situation or the requirements of a task.

Other findings in the study of bilingual/bicultural programs suggest that there is a trend, within these programs, toward a more positive attitude toward the Mexican culture. Cohen's Cross-Cultural Attitude inventory found that this positive attitude increased as the duration of participation in the program increased.[35] Cohen also suggests that patience is required before these results are to be fully experienced because "perhaps it takes more than two years of bicultural education for cultural attitudes to mature."[36] This is a very important hypothesis in light of the new set of regulations proposed by the Department of Education, which would very possibly not offer much to bilingual programs extended over a two year period. The affects of bilingual programs are best delineated by Bernard Spolsky[37]:

> A bilingual program can arise from or affect attitudes of the dominant society, of the local

> community, of the parents, or of the students to themselves and other groups, to varieties of language and their speakers, to education as a whole, and to bilingual education itself.

Suggested Solutions for the Problems of Language Appreciation

> No normal person, and no normal community, is limited to a single way of speaking, to an unchanging monotony that would preclude indication of respect, insolence, mock seriousness, humor, role distance, and intimacy by switching from one mode of speech to another.[38]

When, and only when, this realization is made and appreciated can attitudes of and toward bilinguals be stabilized to allow for successful bilingual programs. It must be realized that bilinguals do have important contributions to make to this society as bilinguals, as Sánchez has stated in reference to international relations (see page 12).

Other fears that may be less often expressed by the dominant group can also be elliminated by Cohen's findings that[39],

> All three group levels of students in the Bilingual Project rated Anglo culture as positively as did students in the comparison groups, suggesting that there need not be a loss of esteem for Anglo culture when Mexican culture is an integral part of the curriculum. Rather, the Bilingual project appears to be instilling a sense of dual culturalism or biculturalism within the participants.

In fact, the initiating of bilingual programs cannot be viewed as a cultural invasion of American society. That would be foolis. The international state of the country can very well be a reflection of its citizens' lack of appreciation for cultural diversity within the country itself. Being terminated once a "suitable" level of English language proficiency is achieved, most of today's bilingual programs are as successful at helping maintain an equal proficiency in the mother tongue and culture,

as eating an orange-shelled taco gives an insight to Mexican cuisine!

However, improved bilingual maintenance programs can greatly improve the attitudinal factors involving bilinguals. First, teachers must realize that there do exist many positive aspects of bilingualism. A well run program could also solve the "problem" of educating bilinguals by increasing the student incentive to go to school.[40] However, it is a vicious circle and teachers themselves must assess their own behavior before they can evaluate their attitudes. This behavioral assessment is very important, especially in consideration of Tuckman, et al.'s 1969 finding that "information about classroom conduct by itself was not as effective in changing teacher behavior as when is was accompanied by details about the teachers' specific behaviors in their own classrooms."[41]

If the dominant group's attitudes are to be changed to a more favorable position toward Mexican Americans, they must first be willing to understand the importance of the Spanish language as an ethnic marker and as one of the basis from which the Mexican American bilingual draws his identity. This would be the first step toward simple appreciation of not only the Mexican culture, but more importantly in our bilingual communities, the Chicano culture as well. However, due to the Anglo ethnocentrism of the dominant society, it is necessary, in order to illicit this cultural appreciation, to encourage Mexican Americans themselves to appreciate their culture and not view it from an Anglo point of view simply because we happen to be living in an Anglo society.

The advances being made toward cultural and linguistic appreciation are coming mainly form the Mexican American bilingual community. However, these advances should not be aimed solely at the Anglo society, but at the bilinugal community as well. Ryan and Carranza's claim about the affect of a group's own attitude toward itself on the society in general cannot be over-emphasized.[42] There exists enough conflict within the community, especially on the topic of self-referents to require a sensitivity especially on the part of Chicano researchers.

A movement within the Chicano movement itself calling for an appreciation of all levels of language variation, and even a tolerance for the resistence toward some of them would also be instrumental in preventing devisively extremist attitudes. George Sánchez' flat denial of the "Spanish-American" self-referent (although not totally uncalled for in some cases where these people wish to have absolutely no association with anything Mexican) does not encourage favorable response toward the movement from those Mexican Americans who so call themselves, and are considered to be the more "asimulados." However, rejection of the word "Chicano" would also place one in an ostracized position from the benefits of the political movement which usually identifies itself as "Chicano." We must all be sensitive to each other's attitudes and compromise where possible, but continue to move toward a greater appreciation of our culture by ourselves and the dominant society in which we live. Too much compromising, however, may have negative affects and a consciousness of our ultimate goals toward community advancement must always prevail.

It is through conciousness raising among ourselves and society in general that we can achieve full acceptance as equals and contributors to the well-being of the whole society. One of the most productive ways to achieve these goals is through the work of culturally conscious Mexican Americans, in a field respected for developing ideologies similar to those concerning an appreciation of the Mexican American culture and language. Ramírez' view of future work toward these ends is best expressed in his own words[43]:

> It is hope that (the Chicano psychologists' beginning development of a Latino psychology that reflects this mestizo world view and the mestizo multicultural experience) will become a part of a worldwide movement to develop theories and approaches in the social sciences that are based on the history, culture, and traditions of the people involved. One of the most important goals of the Chicano psychology movement, then, is to identify the positive effects of diversity on individuals and societies and to counteract the tendency of traditional social science to be ethnocentric and colonial in its orientation.

FOOTNOTES

[1] E. Bouchard Ryan and M. A. Carranza, "Ingroup and Outgroup Reactions to Mexican American Language Varieties," in Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations, ed. H. Giles (London: Academic Press, 1977), p. 60.

[2] Manuel Ramírez, III, "Recognizing and Understanding Diversity: Multiculturalism and the Chicano Movement in Psychology," in Chicano Psychology, ed. Joe L. Martínez, Jr. (New York: Academic Press, 1977), p. 344.

[3] Arnulfo G. Ramírez, "Language Attitudes and the Speech of Spanish/English Bilingual Pupils," in Latino Language and Communicative Behavior, ed. R. P. Durán (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1980).

[4a] Ibid.

[4b] Ryan and Carranza, p. 62.

[5] Ibid., p. 64.

[6] Ramírez, A., p. 13.

[7] Ryan and Carranza, p. 68.

[8] Ramírez, A., p. 10.

[9] Andrew D. Cohen, A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1975), p. 258.

[10] Ryan and Carranza, p. 64.

[11] Cohen, p. 251.

[12] Ryan and Carranza, p. 70.

[13] Cf. Guadalupe Valdés, "Code-Switching and the Classroom Teacher," in Language in Education: Theory and Practice, Vol. 4 (Arlington, VA: Center of Applied Linguistics, 1978).

[14] Cohen, p. 258.

[15] George I. Sánchez, "Spanish in the Southwest," in Aztecas Del Norte: The Chicanos of Aztlán, ed. Jack D. Forbes (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1973), p. 218.

[16] Cohen, p. 252.

[17] Ibid.

FOOTNOTES (CONT')

[18] Ramírez, A., p. 2.

[19] Lily Wong Fillmore, "Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition, " in Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior, ed. C J. Fillmore and W. S. Y. Wong (New York: Academic Press, 1979), p. 227.

[20] Ramírez, A. p. 11.

[21] Ibid., p. 3.

[22] Ibid., p. 5.

[23] Ibid., p. 8.

[24] Bernard Spolsky, "Establishment of Education Policies," in Frontiers of Bilingual Education, ed. Bernard Spolsky and Robert L. Cooper (Rowley, Mass.: New Bury House Publishers, Inc., 1977), p. 16.

[25] Ibid., p. 17.

[26] Ryan and Carranza, p. 70.

[27] The Federal Education Project Newsletter, Sept. 1980, p. 2.

[28] Ryan and Carranza, p. 63.

[29] Ibid., p. 61.

[30] Ibid., p. 62.

[31] Spolsky, p. 2.

[32] Sánchez, p. 220.

[33] Ramírez, M., p. 347.

[34] Ibid., p. 340.

[35] Cohen, p. 244.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Spolsky, p. 16.

[38] Dell Hymes, Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972), p. 38.

FOOTNOTES (CONT')

[39] Cohen, p. 245.

[40] Cohen, p. 259.

[41] Ramírez, A., p. 20.

[42] Ryan and Carranza, p. 62. (For further information on teachers' behavioral assessment see paper by Robert L. Carrasco, Arthur Vera, and Courtney Cazden on "Aspects of Bilingual Students' Communicative Competence in the Classroom: A Case Study" in Latino Language and Communitive Behavior, ed. R. P. Durán (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1980).

[43] Ramirez, M., p. 348.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cohen, Andrew D. A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1975.

The Federal Education Project Newsletter, Sept. 1980, Wash., DC.

"Porposed Rules," Federal Register, Vol. 45 N. 152, Tues. Aug. 5, 1980, Department of Education, Wash, DC.

Fillmore, Lily Wong. "Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition." Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior. Ed. C. J. Fillmore and W. S. Y. Wong. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1979.

Hymes, Dell. Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.

Ramírez, Arnulfo G. "Language Attitudes and the Speech of Spanish/English Bilingual Pupils." Latino Language and Communicative Behavior. Ed. R. P. Durán. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1980.

Ryan, E. Bouchard and Carranza, M. A. "Ingroup and Outgroup Reactions to Mesican American Language Varieties." Language Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations. Ed. H. Giles. London: Academic Press, 1977.

Sánchez, George I., "Spanish in the Southwest." Aztecas Del Norte: The Chicanos of Aztlán. Ed. Jack D. Forbes. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1973.

Spolsky, Bernard. "Establishment of Education Policies." Frontiers of Bilingual Education. Ed. Bernard Spolsky and Robert L. Cooper. Rowley, Mass.: New Bury House Publishers, Inc., 1977.

Valdés, Guadalupe, "Code-Switching and the Classroom Teacher." Language in Education: Theory and Practice, Vol. 4. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.